

## **Sustainable Design Metrics Working Group Meeting**

Date: March 2, 2005-03-06  
Place: Utile Inc., 50 Summer St., Boston, Ma  
Attendees: John Boehs, chair (Arup), Tim Love (Utile Inc.), David Amann (NStar),  
Joe Carroll (KeySpan), Marie Zack Nolan (EOEA staff)

---

### **Discussion on 3-10-05 Working Group Presentation to Roundtable**

- State-of-the-Art
  - The City of Chicago developed The Chicago Standard to guide the design and construction of green municipal buildings based on LEED points. Before developing the standard, the City analyzed its code and regulations to determine regulatory barriers to building green. The link to the standard is:  
[http://egov.cityofchicago.org/webportal/COCWebPortal/COC\\_ATTACH/ChicagoStandard.pdf](http://egov.cityofchicago.org/webportal/COCWebPortal/COC_ATTACH/ChicagoStandard.pdf)
  - LEED, CHPS, other rating systems
  - City of Boston – local experience
- Scope of Problems
  - Where does the state want new buildings to be located?  
e.g.) anti-greenfields policy of not having colleges built on pristine land
  - Tailor LEED Checklist for MA Green Buildings to reflect priorities/policies using a focus group process
  - LEED is not transparent enough. No middle ground “managing-up tool” to tell leaders what LEED conveys. Missing from LEED with respect to metrics is clear communication of ideas inherent to the LEED points. Utile has revised LEED checklist to study strategies across categories.
- Process to get to Recommendations:
  - Use LEED as starting point, but change priorities. Add prerequisites to skew priorities to reflect state policies but use USGBC review. Add new things which would require more documentation through a separate process. Make it flexible.  
e.g.) having renewable energy as a prerequisite, anti-sprawl, community building
  - Possible action item: Compare CHPS to LEED
- Post occupancy metrics in LEED:
  - Additional commissioning to make sure built according to standards.
  - Measurement and verification (audits) – can become prerequisite for some authorities.
  - Provide access to data over time
  - Recommissioning
  - Life cycle cost issues – facilities management and consulting – Carter & Burgess
- For-profit developer has different set of criteria than public developer. For-profit wants least expensive up-front cost to get to LEED. State can more easily afford to factor in life cycle costs. Decreases in greenhouse gas emissions are in conflict with a least cost strategy.
- State options could involve requiring at least 2 points in each category so more balanced, because now there is no incentive to achieve a broad based strategy.
- Research Needed:
  - Point by Point comparison of LEED to CHPS using graphic format
  - Study ways to reprioritize LEED for MA
  - Add missing points based on different sets of priorities

- Get more quantitative data
- Life cycle cost issue
- Trade information with other working groups
- Product: LEED type chart tailored for the state.

Next Steps:

- John will develop talking points for 3-10-05 presentation.
- Tim will present LEED checklist developed by Utile which redesigned LEED to show hidden priorities in rating system. Most points are in energy and efficiency with some in water efficiency. Shows categories of points and percentages for: energy, water, site, commissioning and management, materials and finishes.
- Marie will research where state buildings are located.

Next Meeting: To Be Determined